REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9 are currently present in the instant application. Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 have been amended and claims 3 and 8 have been canceled.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugimoto in combination with Sakaizawa and Okamura.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sugimoto is directed to a magnetic toner containing an octahedral particle shape having a specific average diameter etc. and satisfying a specific relationship between a bulk density (A) and a magnetic powder content (B).

However, Sugimoto does not describe or suggest a toner having a specific particle size, having the specific sphericity, and a specific toner quantity and, a specific toner quantity per unit area of the toner image as A as affirmatively recited in the claims of the present invention.

Furthermore, Sugimoto also does not describe or suggest the toner quantity per unit area of the toner thin layer formed on the developing sleeve as B as affirmatively recited in the claims of the present invention.

Still further, Sugimoto does not describe or suggest the specific objectives according to the present invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the specific sphericity of the toner can strongly affect the developing quality, as shown in Fig. 3 of the invention, as well as the image density, as shown in Fig. 4 of the invention.

In addition, the specific fine powder quantity can strongly affect the developing quality as shown in Fig. 5 according to the present invention. As well, the developing quantity can strongly affect the image density, as shown in Fig. 6 of the invention and

toner adhesive property, as shown in Fig. 7 of the present invention.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is concerned with obtaining a developing method showing a favorable image property even when a predetermined amorphous silicon photoconductor etc. is used or even when a surface roughness of a developing sleeve is change by using the foregoing toner.

However, based on Sugimoto, such favorable image property cannot be obtained since Sugimoto does not describe or suggest the toner having the specific properties of the toner of the present invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Sugimoto does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Sakaizawa also does not describe or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. Sakaizawa is directed to a cleaner-less type of image forming apparatus having a specific flexible charge means and recites a toner having a weight average particle diameter of 10 μm or less and a specific sphericity.

However, Sakaizawa does not describe or suggest the specific toner quantity and specific toner quantity per unit area of the toner image as A as recited in the claims of the present invention. In addition, Sakaizawa does not refer to the toner quantity per unit area of the toner thin layer formed on the developing sleeve as B according to the present invention.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Sakaizawa also does not describe or suggest a toner having the specific properties recited in the claimed invention and thus does not and cannot achieved the favorable image property as in the present invention.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that Okamura does not cure any of the noted deficiencies of Sugimoto or Sakaizawa and thus also does not anticipate or render

obvious the claimed invention.

Okamura is directed to a developing device providing a developing roller which surface is treated with sand ballast and also refers to the toner having the specific sphericity. However, Okamura does not describe or suggest that the toner has a specific particle size, the specific toner quantity and a specific toner quantity per unit area of the toner image as A as described and claimed by the present invention.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Okamura does not describe or suggest a toner having the specific properties recited in the claimed invention and thus does not anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention.

Because Sugimoto, Sakaizawa and Okamura, do not describe or suggest any of the specific toner quantity, specific toner quantity per unit area of the toner image A, or the specific toner quantity per unit area of the toner thin layer formed on the developing sleeve as B, the combination of these references also does not describe or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention and the claimed invention is therefore believed to be patentable over the prior art of record.

For all of these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-9 as being unpatentable over Sugimoto in view of Sakaizawa and Okamura is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the foregoing is a full and complete response to the Office action of record. Accordingly, an early and favorable reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is requested. Applicants believe that claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-9 are now in condition for allowance and an indication of allowability and an early Notice of Allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If Examiner feels that a telephonic interview would be helpful, he is requested to call the undersigned at (203) 575-2648 prior to issuance of the next Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Jennifer A. Calcagni, Reg. No. 50,207
Carmody & Torrance LLP
50 Leavenworth Street
P.O. Box 1110
Waterbury, CT 06721-1110
Telephone: (203) 575-2648
Facsimile: (203) 575-2600